Mr. SAGE. I move that when the House journ, it adjourn to meet on Monday next, and upon that motion I call for the yeas and nays.

The Clerk having proceeded to call the roll— Mr. MATTESON. I ask to be excused from voting upon that motion?
The SPEAKER. It is too late. There has

The SPEARER. It is too late. There has been a response to the call, and the Chair decides that the motion is not in order.

Mr. MATTESON. I did not know that there

had been any response, as in that case I was aware that the motion would not be in order.

The SPEAKER. The motion would not be in order for a further reason that a gentleman cannot ask to be excused from voting upon a motion to adjourn; but upon questions other than a motion to adjourn such a motion would be in order.

Mr. MATTESON. I supposed that upon a motion to adjourn over the rule would be different.
The question was then taken upon Mr. Sage's

motion; and there were yeas 48, nays 111. So the House refused to adjourn. Mr. WASHBURN, of Illinois. I move that the

House adjourn, and upon that motion the yeas and nays.

yeas and nays were ordered. veas 59. navs 86.

yeas 50. nays 50.

So the House refused to adjourn.
Mr. GOODRICH. I move a call of the House and upon that motion I demand the yeas and nay
The yeas and nays were ordered.
Mr. MAURICE. I ask to be excused from

voting.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I move that the gentleman from New York be excused from voting.

Mr. SMITH, of Virginia. I rise to a point of

"Every member who shall be in the House when the question is put shall give his vote, unless the House for special reason shall excuse him."

I suppose it is necessary that a gentleman ask-ng to be excused, should assign some specia reason for such request.

The SPEAKER. The motion to be excused from voting is in order: and every gentleman will determine for himself the reasons he has for mak-

ing such a request.
Mr. WHEELER. I rise to a point of order. would like to know whether the gentleman from New York [Mr. MAURICE] is obliged to give his reasons for asking to be excused?

The SPEAKER. The Chair has already stated

that every gentleman can determine for himself the reasons he has for asking to be excused. Mr. SMITH, of Virginia. I really wish to be

Mr. SMITH, of Virginia. I really wish to be informed upon this matter. I never intend to raise a question of order from captious motives; but, in regard to this matter, I desire to be really, informed about the proper construction of the 42d. rule, a portion of which I have already read.

The SPEAKER. The rule seems to contemplate in the seems to contemplate in th plate giving some special reasons; but the Chair, without reflection, supposes that it would be com-petent for gentlemen to ask to be excused, with or

without assigning a reason therefor.

Mr. BANKS. I think the reasoning of the Chair is correct. If I am asked to vote to excuse or not excuse the gentleman from New York, the special reason for my vote is that he has asked to be excused. I can then either vote in the affirmative or negative, as I may think necessary.

Mr. SMITH, of Virginia. I suppose it is manifest, if the rule which I have read means anything.

that it ought to be enforced.

Mr. BENSON. I rise to a question of order.

Does the gentleman from Virginia appeal from the decision of the Chair?

ecision of the Chair?
The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virgiana has not appealed from the decision of the Mr. MAURICE. If the gentleman from Vir-

ginia [Mr. Smith] will give way, I will state to the House my reasons, which will perhaps obvi-ate the necessity for any further discussion. Mr. SMITH. With the permission of the House, I will read another portion of the 42d "All motions to excuse a member from voting

the call of the yeas and nays is commenced; and the question shall then be taken without further There is an amendment to the rule, which reads

That part of rule 42, which allowed a brief ver

bal statement of reasons to be given by any mem-ber for requesting to be excused from voting, re-scinded January, 1845."

The SPEAKER. The Chair decides that it is ary with a me

voting. The Chair thinks that the rules and practice taken together will bear him out in the decision he has made.

Mr. JONES, of Tennessee. I wish to call the attention of the Chair to the fact that the note to

the 42d rule states that that part of the rule which allows a brief verbal statement of reasons to be given by any member requesting to be excused from voting was rescinded January 2, 1845. Since the rescinding of that part of the rule they have not been permitted to give reasons, but they could ask to be excused without assigning any reasons. That has been the practice ever since that part of the rule relating to this subject was Mr. CAMPBELL. I ask to be excused from

voting upon the motion to excuse the gentleman from New York [Mr. MAURICE] from voting.

The SPEAKER. The Chair decides that that proposition is out of order, believing that proposi-tions to excuse gentlemen from voting cannot be thus accumulated.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I will not insist upon my

motion, although I do not wish to be understood as waiving the right to make it.

Mr. CLINGMAN. I make this point of order

for the consideration of the Chair, that a call of the House and a motion to adjourn take precedence of all other questions, and the gentleman cannot make the motion to be excused pending a vote on these.
The SPEAKER. The Chair has decided to-day

that a motion to be excused from voting upon a proposition to adjourn cannot be made. He cannot, therefore, entertain such a motion.

Mr. CLINGMAN. I now make the point of order, that a motion for a call of the House will take precedence of anything but a motion to ad-

take precedence of anything but a motion to adjourn, and therefore, that you cannot entertain a motion to excuse a member with any more propriety than you can a question touching any other proposition. Suppose we did not have a quorum. You could not excuse a member from voting with less than a quorum present. In this way you might stop up a call and get a quorum, and therefore a call of the House must take precedence of

any other motion, except a motion to adjourn.
The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the g tleman from North Carolina [Mr. CLINGMAN] is correct. It is within the recollection of the House that the Chair permitted that motion to be made,

tently upon the part of the Chair.

Mr. CAMPBELL The Journal is full of decisions upon this point. I think it will be shown by reference to the Journals, that in 1849-'50 no erson made that motion oftener than the honor-ble gentleman from North Carolina. Mr. CLINGMAN. I am obliged to the gen-

tleman from Ohio. I will remind the gentleman that upon the memorable day to which he refers, the Speaker decided that a call of the House was not in order, and therefore that there could have been no motions to excuse gentlemen upon that propo-sition. The motions were upon other proposi-tions. A motion for a call of the House was not in order, and we had no quorum voting.

The SPEAKER. It would be in order for gen-

vote upon a motion to adjourn, that they would rather have a full House. The reason of this is very obvious. The Chair having had his attention called to this matter, decides that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Maurics] is not in

Mr. CAMPBELL. I take an appeal from the decision of the Chair; and upon that I demand the yeas and nays.

Mr CLINGMAN. I move to lay the appeal

upon the table; and upon that motion I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The Chair certainly has no disposition to make any decision here that will have an improper bearing upon one side or the other in this controversy. He seeks only to enother in this confroversy. He seeks only to en-force and adhere to the rules as they are. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Campbell] appeals from the decision of the Chair. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Chingman] moves to

Mr. WHEELER. Upon that motion I demand the year and nays.
Mr. RICHARDSON. It is but a repetition of the same question, and I make the same point of order.

The SPEAKER. The Chair cannot entertain

ppeal upon appeal; such is the rule.

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE
House of Representatives,
Thursday, May 11, 1854.

[In continuation.]

Mr. PERKINS, of New York. I am in hopes that I can make a proposition that will put an end to the contest which has been going on here all day. If the House see fit to entertain the proposition I desire to present, I will afterwards reduce it to the form of a resolution. The proposition is this: to allow the debate to proceed one week, and in the mean time direct the Clerk of the House to notify the three thousand clergymen, who lately seen a remonstrance against the passage of the Nebraska bill, that they will be heard if they will come on here, an hour each, in prayer for the succome on here, an hour each, in prayer for the suc-cessful despatch of our business here. [Laughter.] But they must come on at their own expense. I propose, also, as soon as they get through with propose, also, as soon as they get through with their prayers, that then the question upon this bill shall be taken without further debate. I think by that time the House will be in a proper tem-per and disposition to do justice to this bill.

Mr. SMITH, of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of expressing my astonishment— [Cries of "Oh," "Oh," and "Order."] Mr. SMITH, of Virginia. I simply want, Mr eaker, to express my astonishment at the

er in which----[Renewed cries of "Order!" "Order!"] The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virgini aware that debate is not in order.
The Chair will state to the House the question

Mr. CLINGMAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to ex olain on a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will first state the Maurice] asked to be excused from voting on the motion that there be a call of the House. The Chair decided that the motion to be excused was not in order. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Camp-BELL] takes an appeal from that decision. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. CLINGMAN]

coves to lay that appeal on the table. The gen-teman from New York [Mr. MAURICE] again ises, and asks to be excused from voting on the Mr. MAURICE, (correcting.) On the motion lay the appeal on the table.
The SPEAKER. Yes; and the Chair decide

that the gentleman's proposition to be excused is out of order, the whole being based on the origi Mr. WASHBURN, of Maine. I take an appea to the House from that decision of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. The Chair decides that no

appeal can be taken until the previous one is dis-cosed of. This is the principle established under he rule.

Mr. WASHBURN. I wish to understand by an

appeal whether the Chair decides correctly.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has already stated hat one appeal cannot be piled upon another There has been an appeal taken from the decision There has been an appeal taken from the decision made by the Chair that the proposition made by the gentleman from New York, [Mr. MAURICE.] to be excused from voting, was not in order. If this last appeal were entertained, it would be but an appeal upon an appeal, the whole being based on the correctness of the decision first given.

Mr. CLINGMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to with the correctness of the decision for the correctness of the correctness of the decision for the correctness of the decisi

lraw the motion which I made to lay on the table he appeal taken by the gentleman from Ohio, and to make a point of order that an appeal could not be taken pending the motion for a call of the House, which takes precedence of all other busiot be decided unless there was a quorum present and it is to ascertain whether there be a quorum present that a call of the House is made. The very reason on which I took the first exception applies to this, that, upon either a motion for all of the House or a motion to adjourn, these reliminary or collateral questions cannot be made. The SPEAKER. The Chair overrules the

Mr. WASHBURN, of Maine. I ask for the year nd nays on the appeal.

Mr. WHEELER. And I renew the motion to the appeal on the table; and on that motion

sk the yeas and navs. The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. FLAGLER. I move that the House do now djourn; and on that motion I ask for the yeas The yeas and nays were ordered.

The roll was then called; and there were-yea S. nays 90.
So the House refused to adjourn.
Mr. WASHBURN, of Maine. I move that

hen the House does adjourn it adjourns to meet a Saturday next; and on that motion I call for the yeas and nays.

Mr. SMITH, of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I de ire to ask if this question has not been passed

SPEAKER. Very true, it has. But the apse of time, whether it be a day or an hour-conctimes brings reasons for a change of purpose. The Chair therefore holds that a motion to adourn over is in order any time before adjourn

The yeas and nays were ordered.
Mr. MAURICE. Upon this motion to adjourn
over, I ask, Mr. Speaker, to be excused from Mr. WHEELER. And upon that I ask for the

The SPEAKER. The Chair decides that it is not competent for the House to excuse a member, and that a member has no right to ask to be ex-Mr. CAMPBELL. If the Chair will allow me.

will ask a question of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio ill state his question of order.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I would ask the Chair whether there is a distinction between a simple motion to adjourn and the motion to adjourn over

The SPEAKER. The difference is, that the latter, if carried, carries an adjournment for a little onger time. But the subject is not debatable, as the gentleman from Ohio cannot but be aware; and the Chair should be saved from enforcing the rule

n the subject.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Then I reluctantly and espectfully ask to take an appeal from the deci-on of the Chair; and upon that question I call or the yeas and nays.
The SPEAKER. The Chair holds that the ap-

real made in this case by the gentleman from Ohio s not legitimate. The Chair dislikes to be forced make what may seem to be an arbitrary dec sion. But if gentlemen will reflect for a single moment, the Chair thinks he will not be charged with having made any arbitrary decision in the matter. There is an appeal already pending on a case very like the one in question. It is not competent under the rule—nay, it is forbidden under the rule—to pile appeals one upon another. The Chair, therefore, most respectfully declines to en-tertain the appeal made by the gentleman from

The roll was then called; and there were yeas

The roll was the Art, nays 104.

47, nays 104.

So the House refused to adjourn over.

The SPEAKER. The question recurs on the motion to lay the appeal of the gentleman from New York on the table.

Mr. WALLEY. I move to reconsider the vote has which the House refused to adjourn

The SPEAKER. The Chair decides that that motion is not in order, for the reason, and a very palpable one it is, that the motion may be renewed at any time; and where that is the case, Mr. WALLEY. I move that the House d

now adjourn; and on that motion I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was then taken; and there were

eas 61, nays 81.
So the House refused to adjourn.
The SPEAKER. The question recurs upon aying the appeal upon the table.
Mr. MATTESON. I move that when the House adjourns, it adjourn to meet on Monday

The SPEAKER. That motion is not in order, or the reason that, since that motion was last sub nitted, the House has not transacted any business except upon motions to adjourn over, or to adura, in immediate connexion.

Mr. MATTESON. Then I move a call of the

House.
The SPEAKER. That motion is in order a his time.
Mr. SAGE. Upon that motion I call for the year

The SPEAKER. The Chair is reminded that there is already a call of the House pending, and arising out of that question is an appeal which is pending. The question, therefore, first recurs upon laying the appeal taken from the decision of the Chair trees that table and trees the chair trees the table. the Chair upon the table, and upon that proposi-tion the yeas and nays were ordered. The Clerk ill call the roll.

The question was then taken; and decided in

the question was then taken; and declared in the affirmative—yeas 104, nays 51.

So the appeal was laid upon the table.

The SPEAKER. The question recurs upon the motion that there be a call of the House.

Mr. MAURICE. I rise to a privileged question. I move to reconsider the vete by which the appeal was laid upon the table; and on that movements. ion I demand the yeas and nays.

A Voice. Did the gentleman vote in the affirm

ative?
Mr. MAURICE. I did. I voted with the ma

Mr. ORR. I move to lay the motion upon the to modify my motion I will not ask it as a priv-

Mr. MATTESON. Upon that motion I call for he yeas and nays.
The SPEAKER. The Chairdecides the motion which decisions were sustained by a very large najority of the House.

Mr. CAMPBELL. As there is now no appeal

ppeal from that decision.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain that

notion, as it is competent for the House, at any me, to reverse its own decision. Mr. HAMILTON. I move to lay the appeal apon the table.
Mr. CAMPBELL. Upon that motion I call for he yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays.
The yeas and nays were ordered.
The Clerk here commenced to call the roll.
Mr. MATTESON. I move that the House do ow adjourn.
The SPEAKER. The Chair decides that the

notion is out of order, as the Clerk had com-nenced to call the roll.

Mr. MATTESON. Had any response been The SPEAKER. The response was made before, or at least, simultaneous with the motion and the Chair decides that the roll shall be called

The question was then put; and there were yeas 95, nays 43.

So the appeal was luid upon the table, and the decision of the Chair sustained.

Pending the call,

Mr. FARLEY asked to be excused from voting.

The SPEAKER. It is not in order, pending the call of the roll, to ask to be excused. That request must be made before the Clerk commences to call

Mr. FENTON also gave notice that he had paired off with Hon. Mike Walsh for a short Mr. MATTESON. I move that when the

House adjourn, it adjourn to meet on Monday next; and upon it I demand the yeas and nays.

Several MEMBERS. Adjourn now.

Mr. MATTESON. I am desired by some of

The SPEAKER. The gentleman cannot sub nit both motions at once.

Mr. MATTESON. I withdraw the former me ion and submit the latter one; and upon that I de mand the yeas and nays.

nand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was then taken; and there were eas 72, nays 83. So the House refused to adjourn.

Pending the call,
Mr. MORTON gave notice that he had paired ff with Mr. Grow.
Mr. LETCHER also gave notice that he had aired off with Mr. TAYLOR, until he shall return

A VOICE. When will that be?
Mr. LETCHER. I do not know; but until h

does return I have paired off with him.

The SPEAKER. The question now recursion the motion that there be a call of the House Mr. SAGE. I think the question is upon a mointed discussion and the second seco tion to adjourn over until Monday.

Mr. RICHARDSON. At this point I raise a question of order. The House have refused to adjourn over till Monday, and I submit that it is

not competent for gentlemen to make the motion over and over again.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the motion is in order, unless made in such a connexion as to make it out of order. That has been the practice heretofore, and the Chair will so rule.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Upon that motion I demand

The yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was then taken; and decided in the negative—yeas 54, nays 95.

So the House refused to adjourn over.

The question then recurred upon the motion that there he a call of the House.

The question then recently at there be a call of the House. Mr. DEAN. I believe the morning hour has expired. I move that the rules be suspended, and that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union.

The SPEAKER. That motion cannot be entertained, for the reason that there is a otion pending to close debate in committee, which must lake presidence.

ake precedence.

Mr. DEAN. I think my motion ought to be enertained by unanimous consent.
Mr. WASHBURN, of Maine. I move that the

louse do now adjourn.

Mr. MEACHAM. I wish to be excused from oting.
The SPEAKER. The Chair desides that the roposition of the gentleman from Vermont cannot be received.

Mr. MEACHAM. I know that has been the scision of the Speaker; but I wish to suggest to him a decision upon this point made in a previous Congress different from that the Chair now makes. send the journal containing the decision to the

Mr. PHELPS. What is the question before the The SPEAKER. The Chair is stating a ques tion of order. The Chair will say to the gentle man from Vermont that, during the Twenty-nint Congress, the journals show that a motion to ex cuse a member from voting upon a motion that there be a call of the House was entertained; but the Chair has doubts whether it was not done in-advertently, as was the same thing done this morning. The Chair decides that a motion to ex-

cuse a member upon a motion that there be a cal f the House is not in order.

Mr. MEACHAM. The motion was not only

voting by the House.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state, further that the rules at that time permitted a member to give his reasons for asking to be excused from in this respect. The Chair has decided that such a motion is not in order, and he has been sustained in his decision by a very large vote of the House. He makes that decision now, and declares the question that there be a call of the

Mr. SAGE. In order to ascertain whether the House will not conform to precedents set by pre-vious Congresses, I take an appeal from the de-cision of the Chair. After the precedent which has been quoted, I wish to have a decision of the House upon the subject.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks it would be

a very liberal construction of the rules to allow an appeal to be taken; but he wil entertain it sion of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Mr. SAGE. Upon that question I demand the

reas and nays.

Mr. COBB. If the House will all allow me a this late hour, I desire to tender the olive branch—
[Cries of "Yes!" "No!" "Hear him!" "Let's have the olive branch!" and considerable confu-

on.]
Mr. HOUSTON objected.
Mr. WENTWORTH, of Illinois, also objected
Mr. COBB. What I have to say is connected
Mr. COBB. What I have to say is connected ith the business before the House.

[Cries of "Let's hear what it is !"]
The SPEAKER. The gentleman cannot pr eed so long as objections are made.

Mr. COBB. I appeal to gentlemen to withdray neir objections.

Mr. WENTWORTH. I will withdraw my ob

ection.

Mr. HOUSTON. I do not withdraw mine.

The SPEAKER. Then the gentleman from Alabama cannot proceed. The gentleman from Vermont submits the motion that he be excused from voting upon the proposition that there be a call of the House. The Chair decides that the motion cannot be made, and from that decision the gentle-man from New York takes an appeal. The same decision has before been made to-day upon a similar motion, and sustained by a vote of the House The Chair thinks it is a very liberal construction to suppose that the House would reverse its own decision within two hours, but in this one instance he will, nevertheless, give that construction, and permit the appeal to be taken. He will not say what may be his course in the future, if such cases

Mr. RICHARDSON. I move that the appeal do Mr. SAPP. Upon that motion I demand the

Mr. GOODRICH. I move to be excused from oting upon that motion.
The SPEAKER. The Chair decides that the motion is not in order, and he further decides that in this case the gentleman cannot appeal from the decision of the Chair.

The question was then taken upon Mr. Richardson's motion; and decided in the affirmative—

yeas 160, nays 34. So the appeal was laid upon the table. MODIFICATION OF RESOLUTION TO CLOSE DE-

BATE. Mr. RICHARDSON. I propose to modify the notion submitted by me this morning to close ebate in the Committee of the Whole on the state motion submitted by me this morning to close debate in the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union upon the Nebraska bill.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The question is upon ordering a call of the House; is it not? I think we had better have the

The SPEAKER. The Chair will remind gen temen, and they wil see upon a moment's reflec-tion, that the mover of any bill, resolution, or of any original proposition, has the right to withdraw or modify it as he day please, before any action shall have been take; upon it by the House. The Chair certainly think; the gentleman from Illinois has the right to modify his resolution as he may think proper.

Mr. BANKS. I desire to ask the Speaker if he resolution of the gentleman from Illinois is before the House at his time? Is there not an-

other question pending?

The SPEAKER. It is before the House. It would be necessary for the gentleman from Illinois to withdraw his demand for the previous question before he could make any modification, out the Chair thinks it would hen be competent for him to accomplish his pupose. It is true there are other propositions intervening. There is a motion for a call of the House, which must be first put; but the Chair holds that it is still competent for

him to modify his indion.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I will then submit my The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman with draw his demand for he previous question [TO BE CONTINUED.]

Congressional.

THIRTY-THIRD CONGRESS. FIRST SESSION.

Senate .- Tuesday, May 16, 1854. Mr. PRATT presented a memorial that the urnpike road leading from the end of Maryland

avenue be made free.

Mr. BRIGHT presented the recommendation of the grand jury of Washington county, District of Columbia, for an enlargement of the City Hall, or other means for the accommodation of the United States courts of the District.

Also a resolution of the city councils asking that a suitable building be set apart as an armory for the military of the district. BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. PETTIT, on leave, introduced a bill to ascertain and adjust the titles of certain lands in Indiana; and the same was considered and passed.

Also, a bill for the relief of Sylvester T. J. Jerault, assignee of the interest of Henry Richard; and the same was considered and passed. AFRICANIZATION OF CUBA.

Mr. MALLORY submitted the following reso

MALLORY submitted the following resolution.

Resolved, That the recent acts and declarations of the Cuban authorities, considered in connexion with Spain's past policy with reference to that island, are calculated to excite the just apprehensions of the government of the United States of a settled design to throw Cuba ultimately into the hands of its negro population, and to revive there, within a few hour's sail of our shores, the scenes of San Domingo's revolution—a result which the United States will deem alike inconsistent with their progress, their prosperity, and the civilization of the age. Mr. SUMNER objected to the consideration of

he resolution at this time.

Mr. MALLORY said that, while disposed to de pate the matter, if the senator desired it, still, a present, he wished only to have the resolution re-erred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and have the debate on the report of that com mr. SUMNER renewing his objection, the reso

THE BLACK WARRIOR CASE. Mr. SLIDELL moved that 2,000 copies House document, relative to the seizure of the Black Warrior, and other cases of alleged wrongs to American citizens by the authorities of Cuba, be printed for the use of the Senate. Referred to

the Committee on Printing. RELIGIOUS TOLERATION.

Mr. MALLORY said that, yesterday, in the de bate on the subject of securing religious tolera-tion to American citizens abroad, an incidental re-mark was made by the senator from North Carolina, which was calculated to create much mis-apprehension. That senator had repeated a sen timent imputed to what the senator stated was an authorized organ of the Catholic bishop of Saint Louis, to the effect that, as soon as the Catholic Louis, to the effect that as soon as the Catholic population should get the supremacy in any State of the Union, religious toleration would be at an end in that State. The paper from which this statement was taken was called the Shepherd of the Valley. He regretted that such a statement had been made in the Senate; and he felt it to be just to state that he was informed that the state that he was informed that to state, that he was informed that that paper was not the organ or mouthpiece of any bishop of the Catholic church, but had been disavowed as such by the bishop of that diocess. He alluded to the uniform conduct of the Catholic population of the country; and held that, from the colonial times to the present they had shown themselves to the the the present, they had shown themselves to be th

iends of religious toleration.

Mr. BADGER responded in explanation of his emark, and the matter then dropped. VETOED LAND BILL. On motion by Mr. HUNTER, the Senate proseeded to the consideration of the bill granting and to the several States for the benefit of the in-

digent insane, lately vetoed by the President of the United States.

Mr. BUTLER addressed the Senate for an hour in defence of the veto of this bill, and in general exposition of the powers of Congress under the limitations of the Constitution over the public lands. He commented upon, and replied to seve-ral positions taken by Mr. BADGER a few days

since.

He maintained the disposition of the public lands as proposed by this bill was utterly inconsistent with the proper exercise of the powers vested in Congress to dispose of the public lands.

Mr. BROWN obtained the floor.

Mr. HUNTER moved to postpone the bill until

o-morrow.

After some debate on this motion, the question was taken, and, no quorum voting, The Senate adjourned.

House of Representatives.

NEBRASKA AND KANSAS BILL-The House resolved itself into a Committee Whole on the state of the Union, Mr. OLDS in the chair, and resumed the consideration of the bill to establish territorial governments for Ne

braska and Kansas. Mr. MAXWELL, who was entitled to the floor rose for the purpose of addressing the committee, but he yielded to Mr. HUNT, who said: I wish to correct a statement, by remarking publicly that the report in the Globe in respect to what occurred yesterday is untrue, as far as my knowledge goes, and as far as I have been informed by my friends; and that the statements which I have read in the other papers

are substantially true.

Mr. CRAIGE. If the allusion of the gentleman from Louisiana is to anything I said here, I have to say my remarks are substantially reported in the Globe. What he said I did not hear distinctly, and therefore I do not undertake to say what he did say. What I said is substantially reported in did say What I said is substantially repo the Globe, and by that I am willing to stand.

he Globe, and by that I am willing to small made Mr. HUNT. I branded the st tement made yesterday, and the brand is still hissing.

Mr. CRAIGE. The gentleman cannot strut into a scrane, and sneak out of it in that way. scrape, and sneak out of it in that way.

Cries of "Order!" "order!"

Mr. HAVEN said that Mr. Cook, having been

Mr. HAVEN said that Mr. Cook, having been suddenly called away, had left with him some remarks which he desired should be published by permission of the House.

Mr. WALSH. By all means. I hope all the fineds of the state of th friends of the gentleman will follow his example. Laughter.]
Mr. MAXWELL resumed the floor; and, after Mr. MAXWELL resumed the noor; and, after referring to the scenes recently enacted in the House, said he would leave it to the country to determine whether or not the movements of the minority were factious. He trusted that hereafter, as heretofore, their efforts to distract legislation and to mislead the people would prove abortion.

tive.

The bill now under consideration seeks to de clare the Missouri restriction inoperative and void. The proposition is a simple one. It contains no startling or extravagant features; it does not aim startling or extravagant features; it does not aim to interfere with any man's rights or privileges; it imposes no limitation on the liberty of any human being. The only object is to wipe from the statute-book a law which is unequal in its effects, denying to the people of one section of the country privileges which are accorded to the other. The Territories he contended, are the property of all, and no power is given to Congress to thwart the patriotic purposes of our fathers.

He assumed the abarea that the declare the Miss

He assumed the charge that to declare the Mis souri restriction inoperative and void would be a violation of good faith. He apprehended none of the dangers which others feared from the passage of this bill. Where the right is, public conviction will ultimately settle.

Mr. MAYALL said that this question had been

debate in the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union upon the Nebraska bill.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The question is upon ordering a call of the House; is it not? I think we had better have the regular order of business.

Mr. RICHARDSON. If I have not the right

people of the south. We not then repeal the

The questio, is, he said, whether the good faith and honor of the nation shall be maintained, or whether stey shall be trampled on. He was not opposed to organizing territorial governments for those territories, but was against the bill in its often state. His objection related almost exclusively to the clause proposing to repeal the Missouri compromise; conceiving that this would plunge the country into another slavery agitation. He contended the Missouri act of 1820 is not inconsistent with the compromise of 1850.

consistent with the compromise of 1850.

Mr. FLAGLER remarked that the voice of his immediate constituents came to him in tones deep and unbroken, like the cataract on their borders against the repeal of the Missouri compromise, and en-oining upon him the exercise of all the means in his power to oppose the proposed act of legisla-tion. He was happy to say his own views and feelings were in perfect accordance with those of his constituents.

his constituents.

He stated at length his reasons for opposing the Mr. GIDDINGS hailed the discussion of this

Mr. GIDDINGS hailed the discussion of this important question with interest and joy. To those who introduced it he tendered his humble and hearty thanks. They had done more to agitate the question of humanity in one week than he had during twenty years. He rejoiced that the people of the country have been aroused. In reply to the gentleman from Florida, [Mr. MAXWELL.] he said the scenes recently exhibited here were nighly moral and sublime, more so than were ever before exhibited in this hall. The despotic majority attempted to force and gag the minority, who, rather than submit, staid here thirty-six hours without repose, to maintain their right; and they did maintain them, too, presenting a spectacle which should command the admiration of the world. However, some of the minority voted to sus

pend the rules to admit a resolution to terminate debate, thus giving the tyrannical majority the power to put the rope around their necks and gag them. Had these few stood firm and maintained their position, to-day the House would be discussing the Pacific railroad bill, and the Nebraska question would have been thrown over until the next session of Congress. Give him a man of independence, a slaveholder, if you please. Next in the scale of moral degradation is a doughface, and the lowest is the man who undertakes to carry water, on both shoulders.

and the lowest is the man who undertakes to carry water on both shoulders.

He condemned the institution of slavery, and warned northern men of the consequences and responsibility of voting for the Nebraska bill.

Mr. WRIGHT, of Mississippi, said it was not expected that any member holdidg a seat on this floor from the State of Mississippi would ever so far forget himself as to reply to the gentleman from the contraction.

om Ohio.
Mr. GIDDINGS. It is the best argument you ver made or ever will make.
Mr. READY obtained the floor, when, on mo tion, the Committee rose, And the House adjourned.

Supreme Court of the United States,

TUESDAY, May 16, 1854. No. 92. Junius Amis vs. David Myers. eal from the circuit court of the United States or the eastern district of Louisiana. Mr. Jus tice Campbell delivered the opinion of this court, reversing the decree of the said circuit court and remanding the case with directions to perpetuate the injunction granted in this

No. 99. Joseph Guitard et al. vs. Henry Stoddard. In error to the circuit court of the United States for the district of Missouri. Mr. Justice Campbell delivered the opinion of this court, reversing the judgment of the said cir-cuit court, with costs, and remanding the cause with directions to award a venire facias de

vs. F. G. King. Appeal from the district court of the United States for the northern district of California. Mr. Justice Curtis delivered the opinion of this court, affirming the decree of the said district court in this cause, with costs and interest. No. 100. James Irwings. The United States Appeal from the circuit court of the United

tates for the western district of Pennsylvania. Mr. Justice Grier delivered the opinion of this court, affirming the decree of the said circuit court in this cause. No. 126. John G. Deshler vs. George C. Dodge. In error to the circuit court of the United States for the district of Ohio. Mr. court, reversing the judgment of the said cir-

cuit court, with costs, and remanding the cause for further proceedings to be had therein is conformity to the opinion of this court. No. 109. H. W. Rhodes vs. The Steamship Galveston, et al. Appeal from the district cour of the United States for Texas. The decree of

the district court in this cause was affirmed with costs. No. 116. R. F. Nicholls & Co. vs. Pietro Rico et al. In error to the circuit court of the United States for the eastern district of Lousana. On motion of Mr. Benjamin, this cause was dismissed, with costs, the plaintiffs in error having been called under the 43d rule and

failing to appear.

No. 111. James Haynes, plaintiff in error, vs.
the Yates County Bank. This cause was argued by Mr. Lawrence, for the plaintiff in error, and Messrs. Peckham and Gillet, for the defen No. 115. Samuel H. Early, plaintiff in error, This cause was

vs. John Rogers, jr., et al. This cause was argued by Mr. Chase, for the defendants in error, and submitted on a printed argument by Mr. Mason, for the plaintiff in error. William Easby, plaintiff in error vs. Rhoda E. Homans, lessee. This cause was argued by Mr. Lawrence, for the plaintiff in

error, and by Mr. Woodward, for the defendan

in error. No. 133. Zebedee Ring et al., plaintiffs, re.

Hugh Maxwell. The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Ring, for the plaintiffs. Adjourned till to-morrow, at 11 o'clock. Perth correspondent of a Glasgow paper thus describes the hatching of fish in the Tay: "We were furnished with ora nearly chipped, and by means of a glass vessel, filled with water, and a few worsted threads acting as a syphon enabling us to keep up a constant supply of fresh water, we were were gratified by observ-ing the little creature bursting the shell. As in the hen chick, the head is the first part that is freed, and after a few struggles the shell is entirely thrown off. The appearance of the fish at this stage of its being is very interest ing. What is to be the future fish is a mere line with a large head, having very prominent and large eyes. Along the belly of the fish, the gills downwards, is suspended a bag of a heart-shape, and out of all proportion to the size of the fish. This bag contains the heart, &c., part of the yolk of the egg (for still nour-like of the fish. ishing the fish,) and is composed of a very de-licate and quite transparent membrane. Blood-vessels are spread like network over its surface, and the crimson tinge of the blood gives the fry a reddish appearance. Every pulsation may be seen, and the small pectoral fins, which are constantly in motion. The yolk remaining in this bag is gradually absorbed, but we cannot say as yet how many days clapse from the chipping of the shell till this takes place, but we shall know in a few days. The little creature is very nimble, but owing to the size of the bag, it swims on its side. We can easily see from the helplessness of this little animal how it is preyed on in this stage of its existence by the fish in the river, and even by its own species. In France the ova have been hatched in 60 days, but at Perth, owing to the water being kept at an even temperature, it has taken place in 50 days."

a meeting, at which they resolved to charge \$1 50 per day after the 15th inst. A vote of the press in Maryland, for the olding of an editorial convention in Baltimore in June, is being taken. So far the vote is unani-

THE HOD-CARRIERS, of Baltimore, recently held

Washington Seatinel.

WM. M. OVERTON, CH. MAURICE SMITH, AND BEVERLEY TUCKER. CITY OF WASHINGTON.

MAY 17, 1854.

GEORGE W. MEARSON IS OUR authorized tent to receive subscriptions and advertisements. Washington, Georgetown and Alexandria. O. H. P. STEM, is our authorized agent for collecting accounts due this office, and for ob-ing new subscribers in Virginia.

CONGRESS. In the Senate, yesterday, two bills, relating to Indiana private land claims, were introduced by Mr. Pettit and were passed. Mr Mallory submitted a resolution respecting the contemplated Africanization of Cuba, with view to its reference to the Committee or Foreign Relations; but, Mr. Sumner objecting, it could not be considered. The vetoed bill granting land to the several States for the re-

the veto. The House of Representatives resolved it self into the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union on the Nebraska and Kansa bill, when Mr. Maxwell made a speech in favor of, and Messrs. Mayall, Flagler, and Giddings in opposition to the measure.

lief of the indigent insane, was taken up, and

Mr. Butler addressed the Senate in defence of

FREESOILISM.

The congressional factionists have bee striving, as we foretold they would do, to ge up popular demonstrations in the north to sustain their disorganizing conduct, and fill the timid with alarm. The first attempt was made in the city of New York, and it came off or Saturday evening. We were not present, and of course did not witness this demonstration which had been so carefully prepared; but we are informed that it was an entire failure Some of the anti-Nebraska journals aver that the meeting was large and enthusiastic, yet the dull and tame and strained manner in which they speak of it shows that the gathering was small and devoid of interest-composed chiefly of men who followed the impulse of curiosity without having any regard for the subject of the meeting.

But we gather certain facts, from the various ccounts we have received of the New York demonstration, which ought to be noted. In the first place, it is clear that the movement was made by whigs of the woolly-head class acting in conjunction with abolitionists and freesoilers, and their loving partners and con peers, the soft-shells of New York. The factionists in Congress present a fair and just type of the elements of the New York meeting when those who attended from mere curiosity are left out of consideration. In such a city as New York, it is an easy matter to assemble four or five thousand men after business hours to witness any exhibition which costs nothing. A free dog-fight, duly advertised, with open doors and no tickets of admission, will bring ten thousand men together at any time in the city of Gotham. This being the case, a failure to assemble a large meeting in New York, after strenuous exertions and due notice given that a prominent and leading political measure was to be considered, must be regarded as a failure indeed. The character of the meeting is, however, the

mportant point to be considered; and its character can be properly estimated only by the complexion of the men whose names appear as leaders and orators on the occasion, and by the entiments which they announced. The names which are known to us prove that the gathering in New York, on Saturday, was a meeting of woolly-head whigs and abolitionists, and of the freesoil and soft-shell co-partnership. Benja min F. Butler, the right-hand man of Mr Van Buren, was the first speaker to mount the rostrum; and, after mounting the rostrum, he entertained for an hour those who would listen to him, with distribes levelled at the Nebraska bill. This same Benjamin F. But ler is one of the Buffalo men of 1848; and he is the oldest and most prominent leader, nov resident in New York, of the faction which was formed by the fusion of the forces of the free soilers under the command of Mr. Van Buren and the soft-shells, who marked time, marched and halted, turned, and wheeled, and changed front to rear, and rear to front, at the biddin of the Secretary of State, and who have been wielding, since the 4th of March, General Pierce's patronage to punish and crush out the men who procured General Pierce's nomi About the time that a printer to the Hous

of Representatives was elected to succeed Gen. Armstrong, it was announced, by the paper which is understood to be the government or gan, that the Nebraska bill was not a test question. It had averred the contrary just be fore; but that averment did not seem to be embarrassing. We will not repeat what has come to our ears on this point, explanatory of the reasons which induced the relaxation of the Nebraska test, because we have to deal with the present, rather than the past. We have alluded to the relaxation of the test as a part intimately connected with, and necessary to explain the factious proceedings in the Hous of Representatives, and the composition and complexion of such meetings as that which came off in New York on Saturday. It is very well known to the whole country

that the whole weight and influence of the ad ministration was given to the freesoil and softshell alliance in New York last fall, and that government minions undertook to ostracize those who objected to such a course of policy. and who predicted that the traitors of 1848 had no claim to confidence or reward, and would be treacherous and treasonable again, whenever an opportunity offered to make treachery and treason profitable. Now, it turns out that on the first test question—the first to which the President and the democratic party are thoroughly committed-the Van Buren freesoilers and Seymour soft-shells, fat from emoluments, confident from patronage and insolent from plunder, present a factious front and make bold war upon an administration which does not seem to be able to disengage itself from improper commitments and impure entangle

more of Æsop. They seem determined to imitate the frozen screent, and sting the breast that warmed them. But, perhaps, we are speaking too fast. It may be that the farmer knew or ought to have known the venemous qualities of the reptile he let loose. In that event, it is not difficult to trace the steps of men in authority.

We have been maligned and abused by the low servants of the administration. We have been maligned and abused by the miserable corps of confidential confreres of the administration. We have been slandered and traduced by their officers, and slandered and traduced ov all their adjuncts; so that our moderation is the moderation which we feel from the inspiration of honest purpose. From the beginning the threat has been sent abroad that the Sentinel would be annihilated. We can tell our kind friends, who wish to destroy us, that they may arge their attermost and we will not be hurt. The Sentinel has no fear of annihilation at the hands of bad dramatists, no matter how glorious they may feel; nor at the hands of oad lawyers, no matter how ignorant or how

supple they may be. But to return to our sheep. It seems to us, unsophisticated as we are, that the regular administration prints, like the Washington Union and the Boston Post, make no mention of the infamous and revolutionary proceedings in which the New York soft-shells have been engaged. Why is this? How does it happen in the ordinary course of events? Is it because the organ does not wish to drive any one off from the support of the Nebraska bill? Surely not. How is it, then, that the Washington Union still hugs the abolitionists and freesoilers to its bosom? Does not the mere fact

brand upon its forehead a damning scar? In Congress and out of Congress the whole tribe of Van Buren freesoilers, with their softshell attachment, are factious, revolutionary, and disorganizing. The yeas and navs in the House of Representatives and the wicked movements out of Congress prove it. Yet the administration, although it has acquiesced in the Nebraska bill, continues to lavish its patronage on the enemies of that bill. The adninistration pleads that neither Mr. Cochrane nor Mr. Fowler, nor any of its multitudinous freesoil and soft-shell appointees have taken an active part in anti-Nebraska meetings, and that punishment cannot therefore reach them rightfully. But if these named men have apparently kept quiet, they have not been actually quiet; for their servants and understrappers have been busy, and mischievously, laboring in season and out of season to defeat the Nebraska bill. Yet General Pierce has not turned his face away from the factionists. They still glory in his intimacy, and boast of his confidence. If their vaunting be true, then, indeed, has a dark day fallen on us. But we for bear to say more.

FALSE PATRIOTS AND CLAMOROUS

DEMAGOGUES-THE TRIBUNE. Many articles in this world are dear. Eggs are always dear at christmas, and chickens in the first of the chicken season. But, however high, meats, birds, fish, and vegetables may be there is one commodity that is always cheappatriotism. It costs literally nothing. It does not cost money; for the poorest sot in the lowest groggery, who has not a copper to invest in a dram of that nauseating kind of whisky known by a name neither decent, poetical, nor euphonical, can beat up a due quantity of patriotism. It does not demand virtue; for the and we have high authority for so saying. Dr. Johnson has said "that patriotism is the last refuge of a scoundrel." It does not require intelligence; for the biggest fool is most apt to

be the most clamorous patriot. But there are two kinds of patriotism; one is real, the other fictitious; one the virtue itself, the other an imitation of it; one the true coin, the other its counterfeit. The first is a sentiment, an affection; it is honest, genial, pure, and uncalculating. The last is a trade full of tricks, devices, deceits, and frauds.

Whilst pure patriots are scarce, false patriots are abundant; and the fewer real natriots there are, the greater is the number of spurious pa-The country is now troubled with a swarm of these false patriots, who are indignant at, and because of, what they call the Nebraska iniquity. They keep themselves and their

neighbors in a ferment of virtuous passion.

They invoke the aid of noisy meetings, of pul-

pit fulminations, and of abolition fanaticism At the head of these people stands Horace Greeley, the editor of the No York Tribune. Who is Mr. Greeley? What sacrifices has be ever made for his country, that he should set up for so flaming a patriot? In what battles has he signalized his prowess and his courage, that he should be a notable captain and leader? We have always heard of him as a man without a fixed and steadfast principle. We have always heard of him as a reviler of the best men of the country, an enemy to the Constitution, a disorganizer, a leveller, and a rank abolitionist. A canting hypocrite, he pretends to love religion, while he sows broadcast over the land ideas and doctrines at variance with religion. He talks of patriotism, while he manifests a deep-rooted hatred of his country, by seeking to array brother against brother, and the north against the south; and, to get rid of some of the settled institutions of the country, he would even destroy that country itself. He talks of philanthropy, when no one that we have ever seen could tell of one good disinterested act that he has done. He talks of peace, when he is ever seeking to raise up mobs, excite public disturbances, and embroil members of Congress in difficulties and quarrels.

He is the head devil of malevolent malcontents, not one of whom that we know of has ever done aught for his country. He is a great abolitionist; he is the captain-general of that band. Who can point to one single abolitionist who has done a great or disinterested act in the councils of his country, or has contributed to that country's glory, by gallant and heroic services in the field? Is there one single abolition general, colonel, captain, lieutenant or sergeant? Is there one single abolition soldier that the country knows of and that the country honors?

No; when men become abolitionists, they lose their manhood, because they lose their virtue. But that sainted patriot, that august philoso-

The freesoil and soft-shell appointees of the administration seem determined to illustrate a pher, that great philanthropist, Horace Greeley, is outraged by the Nebraska bill: He is filled